

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action mailed December 19, 2005 has been received and reviewed. Applicants have amended claims 88, 89, 92, 93, 104, 105, 114, 124, 125, 133-135, 137, 138, 141, and 143-145 to clarify the scope of the claimed invention.

THE SECTION 102 REJECTION

Claims 88-95, 100-106, 112-115, 117-119, 124, 133, 137, 140, 144 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Malinowski. The Examiner provided a picture of Figure 7 of Malinowski and labeled the figure with the corresponding structures set forth in independent claims 88 and 114. Although Applicants appreciate the Examiner's efforts in attempting to associate various claim elements with the structure illustrated in Figure 7 of Malinowski, Applicants maintain that several of the named structures identified by the Examiner are incorrect.

Applicants have previously asserted throughout the prosecution of this application that structure 42 of Figure 7 of Malinowski cannot be the frame mount assembly. A detailed discussion regarding the structures defined in the pending claims and the structure disclosed in Malinowski was previously set forth in the Amendment filed by Applicants on September 23, 2005. Such discussion along with the arguments for patentability of the claimed invention are incorporated herein so that such discussion and arguments do not have to be repeated herein.

Claims 88 and 114 include the following limitations for the frame mount assembly, namely 1) the frame mount assembly includes a connection assembly designed to connect to a portion of a vehicle frame, 2) the frame mount assembly is designed to be substantially non-detachably mountable to a frame at a front portion of the vehicle, 3) the frame mount assembly is designed to not connect to a front bumper of the vehicle, 4) the frame mount assembly is mountable to the vehicle frame such that a majority of the frame mount assembly is positioned below the vehicle front

bumper, 5) the frame mount assembly is mountable to the vehicle frame such that no portion of the frame mount assembly extends beyond the vehicle front bumper, 6) the frame mount assembly is mountable to the vehicle frame such that no portion of the frame mount assembly connects to or extends outwardly from the outer sides of the vehicle, 7) the frame assembly includes a connection arrangement that enables the support mount assembly to be detachably connected to the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly, 8) a majority of the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly designed to be positioned below the bottom level of the front bumper of the vehicle when the frame mount assembly is mounted to the vehicle, 9) the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly designed to fully secure the support mount assembly to the frame mount assembly, 10) the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly including a plurality of connectors, 11) the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly including at least two connectors designed to at least partially connect the support mount assembly to the frame mount assembly, 12) the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly including at least one engagement arrangement designed to receive at least a part of a front portion of the support mount assembly, 13) the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly designed to at least partially limit movement of the support mount assembly relative to the frame mount assembly when the support mount assembly is secured by the connection arrangement of said frame mount assembly, 14) the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly including at least one connector that is spaced forwardly from the engagement arrangement on the frame mount assembly, and 15) the frame mount assembly does not engage with the plow mount assembly.

Structure 42 in Figure 7 of Malinowski does not and cannot satisfy at least features 1, 2, 5, 6, 14 and 15. For instance, structure 42 does not connect to any portion of the frame of the vehicle. Structure 42 only connects in slot 60 of the support assembly as illustrated by the Examiner. As

such features 1 and 2 cannot be satisfied by structure 42. Structure 42 also is designed to extend beyond the front end of the bumper when connected to the support assembly. As such, feature 5 cannot be satisfied by structure 42. Structure 42 also is designed to connect to slot 60 which is located on the outer side of the vehicle. As such feature 6 cannot be satisfied by structure 42. Structure 42 includes only two connectors 52; however, neither of these connectors are spaced forwardly from an engagement arrangement on the frame mount assembly. Indeed, structure 42 does not have separate structures for the connectors and an engagement arrangement. Structure 42 is also illustrated as directly engaging the “plow mount assembly.” This arrangement is directly contrary to the limitations set forth in claims 88 and 114. For any one of the reasons set forth above, structure 42 cannot be the frame mount assembly defined in claims 88 and 114.

Applicants have also previously asserted that the structure identified by the Examiner as the “support assembly” (54, 58, 60, 64) would be better characterized as the “frame mount assembly” as defined in the claims. However, as previously noted, even if the “support assembly” were reclassified as the “frame mount assembly”, the “support assembly” identified by the Examiner would still not satisfy at least features 3, 4, 6 and 8. Applicants further submit that the structure identified by the Examiner as the “support assembly” in Figure 7 of Malinowski does not and cannot satisfy several of the limitations for the “support mount assembly” defined in claims 88 and 114. Claims 88 and 114 include the following features with regard to the “support mount assembly”, namely 1) the support mount assembly is connected to one end of the frame structures of the plow mount assembly, 2) the support mount assembly includes a connection arrangement to allow for pivotal mounting of the plow mount assembly, 3) the support mount assembly is designed to be detachably connected to a connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly, 4) the support mount assembly is fully secured to the frame mount assembly by the connection arrangement of the

frame mount assembly, 5) the support mount assembly is at least partially connected to the frame mount assembly by at least two connectors on the frame mount assembly, 6) the support mount assembly includes a front portion designed to be received by at least one engagement arrangement of the connection arrangement of the frame mount assembly, and 7) the support mount assembly has limited movement relative to the frame mount assembly when connected to the frame mount assembly.

Structure (54, 58, 60, 64) in Figure 7 of Malinowski does not and cannot satisfy at least features 1 and 2. The plow mount assembly that is designated by the Examiner in no way connects directly to the support assembly. Only the structures labeled as “frame mount assembly” and “lift mount assembly” in Figure 7 of Malinowski connect to the “plow mount assembly.” As stated above, it is important to note that claims 88 and 114 expressly require that the “plow mount assembly” not connect to the “frame mount assembly.”

Applicants resubmit that for any of the reasons set forth above, Malinowski does not anticipate or make obvious any of the pending claims.

II. THE SECTION 103 REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claims 121, 122, 125, 127, 128, 134, 138 and 141 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malinowski.

As set forth above, the structure of the plow blade unit disclosed in Malinowski is very different from the components of the snowplow mount assembly defined in claims 88 and 114. Applicants resubmit that independent claims 88 and 114 are not anticipated or made obvious in view of Malinowski. For at least this reason, dependent claims 121, 122, 125, 127, 128, 134, 135 and 141 are not obvious in view of Malinowski.

Applicants submit that the claims presently pending in the above-identified patent application

are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE

By:

BRIAN E. TURUNG
Reg. No. 35,394
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
Telephone: (216) 861-5582
Facsimile: (216) 241-1666

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 3-15-06

Adeline Machado
(SIGNATURE)